



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,700	02/27/2004	Sidlgata V. Sreenivasan	P107/MII-72-54-03	6995
25108	7590	01/18/2008	EXAMINER	
MOLECULAR IMPRINTS			DANIELS, MATTHEW J	
PO BOX 81536			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78708-1536			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/788,700	SREENIVASAN, SIDLGATA V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW J. DANIELS	1791	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See the enclosed response to arguments.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments would change the scope of the dependent claims, and would require at least further consideration.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 18 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments appear to be on the following grounds:

- a) The 102 rejection is overcome in view of the incorporation of the subject matter of Claims 21-23 into Claims 1, 9, and 16, respectively.
- b) The etch barrier of Colburn is solidified while in contact with the substrate. In Everhart, a stamp is inked and allowed to dry, then applied to a surface. Thus, solidification in Everhart occurs while the ink is in contact with the stamp, and not in contact with the surface. The combination does not teach or suggest solidifying a plurality of flowable regions.
- c) Letterpress printing, such as the method of Howell, is a direct printing method. It does not include an imprint lithography mold, and does not contact flowable regions with lithography molds. It also does not include the subject matter of Claims 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 17.

2. These arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

- a) These claim amendments are not being entered as they would change the scope of other dependent claims.
- b) The arguments against Everhart have been considered as they apply to Claims 21-23. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Everhart teaches merely that it is known to provide discreet, separate regions, instead of one continuous, uninterrupted film. In

combination with Colburn, it is submitted that one would have found it obvious to provide discrete regions of imprinting in the Colburn method in order to avoid coating the entire wafer. One of ordinary skill is not an automaton, and would have recognized that it would be desirable in many instances to provide separated and discreet imprinted regions on a substrate while leaving other portions blank in order to provide a different treatment in those regions or greater RIE etching.

c) The distinction asserted by Applicants' arguments does not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. At the point when the ink on the stamp of Howell touches the substrate, it appears to be immaterial whether the ink was placed on the stamp initially or on the substrate. No criticality appears to be attributed to the initial placement of the ink on the substrate instead of the stamp. In other words, the configuration depicted in instant Figure 6 would also be achieved by the Howell reference when the ink on the letters touches the substrate. While it may be traditional to ink the stamp, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to apply ink the substrate instead of the stamp. In achieving the recognized goal of applying ink to a substrate, there are a finite number of places where the ink can be placed. The instant invention appears to have merely chosen the other possible placement for the ink.

It is submitted that the subject matter of all other claims argued would have also been obvious for these reasons and for those set forth in the rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. DANIELS whose telephone number is (571)272-2450. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJD 1/8/08

MJD

CH
CHRISTINA JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER